



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/810,766

03/26/2004

Geoffrey R. Kruse

M61.12-0629

9088

27366

7590

11/10/2008

WESTMAN CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)

SUITE 1400

900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH

MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3244

EXAMINER

CAO, PHUONG THAO

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2164

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/10/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/810,766

Applicant(s)

KRUSE ET AL.

Examiner

Phuong-Thao Cao

Art Unit

2164

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Phuong-Thao Cao, Examiner.

(3) Alan Rego, Agent (Reg. No. 45,956).

(2) Hung Vy, Primary Examiner.

(4) Geoffrey Schlueter, Applicant.

Date of Interview: 05 November 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: Claim 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Bedell et al. (US Patent No 6,996,568).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed the claimed invention and the distinction between the claimed invention and the cited reference. Examiners indicated that many of the discussed features weren't specify in the claimed language. No agreement had been reached. Applicant requested another interview to discuss a proposed amendment to further specify the claimed invention and Examiners agreed to schedule another interview when needed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Hung T Vy/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2163